



# CITY OF MILWAUKIE

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

City Hall Council Chambers  
10722 SE Main Street  
[www.milwaukieoregon.gov](http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov)

August 10, 2021

**Present:** Joseph Edge, Vice Chair  
Greg Hemer  
Adam Khosroabadi  
Robert Massey  
Jacob Sherman

**Staff:** Laura Weigel, Planning Manager  
Vera Kolias, Senior Planner  
Justin Gericke, City Attorney

**Absent:** Lauren Loosveldt, Chair  
Amy Erdt

(00:00:05)

### 1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters\*

**Vice-Chair Edge** called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

**Note:** The information presented constitutes summarized minutes only. The meeting video is available by clicking the Video link at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/meetings>.

(00:00:29)

### 2.0 Informational Items

No information was presented for this portion of the meeting.

(00:00:37)

### 3.0 Audience Participation

No information was presented for this portion of the meeting.

(00:01:26)

### 4.0 Work Session

(00:01:37)

#### 4.1 Summary: Comprehensive Plan Implementation - Draft Code/Map Amendments –Batch #1

**Vera Kolias, Senior Planner** shared an update about the Comprehensive Plan Implementation project. The policy mandates were to increase the supply of middle

housing, increase city-wide tree canopy and preserve existing trees, and manage parking to enable middle housing. Draft code and maps were under development. The Comprehensive Plan included a policy to create an equitable distribution of housing choices throughout the city. Some of the key amendments were to:

- Consolidate the eight residential zones to six
- Allow lot size to determine permitted housing types
- Allow middle housing to be permitted as attached or detached units
- Require one parking space per unit and allow the space to be located in the driveway or setback
- Require tree preservation, protection, and replacement of removed trees in new development and private property

The code will still have development standards, such as maximum lot coverage, building height, minimum landscaping, and setbacks. The outcome will be code amendments that balance the city's goal for a 40% tree canopy and implementation of the housing policies outlined in House Bill 2001.

The purpose of this meeting was to present the comprehensive plan and land use map, zoning map, permitted uses, definitions, parking, ADU review and design, and development standards. On August 10, there will be a discussion about flag lots and back lots, natural resource code, and Title 17 – Land Division. On August 24, which will be the final meeting prior to the public hearing there will be a focus on tree code, and design and development standards for middle housing.

There was a proposal for new definitions related to middle housing. Those included middle housing, multi-unit development, quadplex, triplex, and uses allowed by right. Some of the key code amendments regarding ADUs were to allow them by right and subject them to design and development standards, and revisions to the footprint requirement for accessory structures more than 3 years old when converted to an ADU. There was a proposal to create a new Type II variance for Type B ADUs for a 25% increase in size over the maximum square feet currently allowed instead of a Type III variance. Yurts will no longer be an allowed detached ADU because Yurts do not meet the building code.

**Commissioner Sherman** asked about the rationale of the different sizes of an ADU and the 25% variance option. **Kolias** responded, this would give the applicant some flexibility as they designed their ADU. A Type II ADU would require a Neighborhood District Association and public notice. This aligned with other variances within the code for setbacks, lot coverage, and fences. **Commissioner Sherman** understood that the code only allowed one ADU per lot. They were interested in discussing the possibility of an attached and detached ADU per lot. **Kolias** responded, currently, the plan was one ADU per lot. **Kolias** wanted to discuss this further. **Commissioner Hemer** shared, one or two ADUs should be maximum to ensure if cottage clusters needed to be built that should be the focus instead of building multiple ADUs. **Vice Chair Edge** shared, each duplex, triplex, or quadplex should be allowed to have an ADU. Also, single dwelling units should be permitted two ADUs per lots as long as they followed the code requirements, such as maximum lot coverage, minimum vegetation, and other requirements. **Commission Khosroabadi** asked, were there any cons to allowing more

than one ADU on a lot? **Kolias** responded, they did not think there were any cons and wanted the group to keep in mind that as the code was written there were not any parking requirements for ADUs, therefore ADU parking is likely to occur on the street. **Commissioner Sherman** shared, two ADUs should be outright permitted and it did not matter if the ADU would be attached or detached. **Commissioner Hemer** shared, where density was happening additional ADUs should not be permitted. **Vice Chair Edge** asked, if staff would be willing to draft language regarding ADUs with middle housing for a later discussion?

**Kolias** presented the draft parking code updates. The proposed code was one space per unit, not including ADU's, with an option to have the required space in the driveway or within the setback. There were conversations about parking alternatives, which included the parking modification process or considering incentives for income-restricted housing. There were conversations to incentivize income-restricted housing through the parking requirements. The Planning Department proposed a by right reduction in minimum off-street parking for development meeting a specific level of affordability. Possible code language discussed was to allow any multi-unit dwelling unit or middle housing dwelling unit that was affordable to households earning equal to or less than 80 percent of the area median income (AMI) as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to receive a 25% parking reduction. The reduction would only apply to the income-restricted units. **Commission Khosroabadi** shared, the incentive for affordable housing was beneficial to the city and had the ability to drive more development for affordable housing. **Commissioner Sherman** shared, the percentage could be higher. Maybe 50%. **Commissioner Massey** shared, 25% was not a needle mover. **Commissioner Hemer** shared, the parking reductions should be based on income tiers because some of individuals in the restricted-income housing may have a car. **Vice Chair Edge** shared, they wanted to review the amount of the reduction indexed to the percentage of the AMI the restricted-income housing provided. They agreed with Commissioner Hemer that the developer needed some parking for restricted-income residents. **Kolias** shared, the Planning Department could review the Hillside project and their parking spaces projection. The applicant was developing restricted-income housing and applied for a parking reduction. **Commissioner Sherman** shared, the Planning Department should consider the location of the restricted-income housing and proximity to public transportation. If the two were close maybe the parking modification would permit zero parking spaces. **Kolias** shared, the code already allowed parking modifications for development near public transportation. This was something that needed an additional look to understand how this portion of the code could benefit restricted-income housing. **Commissioner Sherman** shared, it would be beneficial to the City to not require a minimum parking for single family housing. **Kolias** responded, the code needed to be the same for middle housing and single family by state law. **Vice Chair Edge** asked, what Comprehensive Plan policies supported having a minimum parking space per one dwelling unit vs zero parking spaces?

**Kolias** presented the Comprehensive Plan residential maps updates. The plan was to consolidate four residential land use designations to two, which were moderate density and high density. The Moderate Density Residential (R-MD) Zone included what was R-5, R-7, and R-10. The permitted housing types were single-unit detached on moderate to

small lots and middle housing. Any site with natural resource or natural hazard overlays may require a reduction in density. The High Density Residential Zone included R-1, R-1-B, R-2, R-2-.5, R-3. The permitted housing types were a wide variety of housing types with the predominant housing type being multi-unit development. Office uses were outright permitted and commercial uses were conditional uses in limited areas. The zoning permitted uses in the high density zones were not in alignment. Some of the zones outright permitted multi-unit and in other zones, it was a conditional use. Due to the inconsistent criteria between the different zones, it was difficult to consolidate these zones. The Planning Department proposed to maintain the HD zones as they were. The Planning Department would insert middle housing and amend associated minimum lot sizes and terminology as needed. In conclusion, the city will have 6 zones: R-1, R-1-B, R-2, R-2-.5, R-3 and R-MD. **Commissioner Massey** shared, as the Planning Department considered the congregate housing definition it needed to be more diverse and include halfway housing, like a Northwest Housing Alternatives, and temporary housing shelters. **Kolias** and **Vice Chair Edge** agreed. **Commissioner Hemer** would like the Planning Department to conduct more outreach due to lack of public responses. They wanted the Planning Department to ensure what was being proposed aligned with the Comprehensive Plan and what the residents wanted. **Kolias** responded, they went to Milwaukie's Farmer's Market, among multiple outreach efforts, to answer questions about the code updates. **Laura Weigel, Planning Manager** recommended Kolias share an update about the various engagement that they completed thus far. **Commissioner Sherman** agreed that was a great idea. It would be valuable to start each meeting sharing an updated outreach plan with the Planning Commission. **Kolias** shared, there was an article about the project in every pilot newsletter since September 2020.

**Commissioner Sherman** asked about the criteria for townhomes and cottages and wondered how the criteria impacted the tree canopy goals. **Kolias** responded, the criteria was based on House Bill 2001. A cottage cluster had to be part of a cluster and the lot must be at least 1,500 square feet (sf) for each cottage. **Commissioner Sherman** encouraged the Planning Department to take the first sentence from the townhomes' statement and add it to the cottage clusters' statement. They also would like more information about the cottage clusters setbacks. **Kolias** shared, the consultant looked at the cottage cluster codes from other cities and the model code from House Bill 2001. They asked to hold off on discussing this until August 24<sup>th</sup>, when the Planning Department was returning to present the cottage cluster code. From now until then, there was a possibility for some tweaks to the code. **Commissioner Sherman** asked, about the design standards and wanted to make sure those standards were not lost as the City will allow other types of development.

**Kolias** presented the project's timeline. During July and August, they were hosting Planning Commission work sessions, tracking written public comments, and engaging with the public. From September until the code adoption, there will be Planning Commission and City Council public hearings, the final draft code would be posted, and conduct community engagement activities.

(01:48:08)

## **5.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates**

**Weigel** shared, Janine Gates, Assistant Planner was leaving the Planning Department to join the Community Development Department as their Housing and Economic Development Program Manager.

(01:49:00)

## **6.0 Planning Commission Committee Updates and Discussion Items**

**Commissioner Sherman** asked about federal funding for park development. **Weigel** responded, they were unsure and needed to check with Kelly Brooks, Interim Community Development Director. **Commissioner Sherman** wanted an update about the Milwaukie Bikeway plan. **Weigel** responded, the plan went to Council and they did not decide on the preferred plan. That was still in the works.

(01:54:1828)

## **7.0 Forecast for Future Meetings**

August 10, 2021	Work Session Item: Comprehensive Plan Implementation – Draft Code/Map Amendments – Batch #2
August 24, 2021	Work Session Item: Comprehensive Plan Implementation – Tree Code; Draft Code/Map Amendments – Batch #3
September 14, 2021 (tentative)	Hearing Item: VR-2021-013, Bonaventure Senior Living Walkways

**Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

N. Janine Gates  
Assistant Planner